DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 426 SP 041 028

AUTHOR	Dana, Nancy; Silva, Diane Yendol
TITLE	From Readiness to Inquiry: The Unfolding of Supervision in the Professional Development School.
PUB DATE	2000-04-00
NOTE	35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College School Cooperation; Elementary Education; Higher Education; Inquiry; Internship Programs; Mentors; *Partnerships in Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; Reflective Teaching; *Student Teacher Supervisors; Student Teachers; *Supervision
IDENTIFIERS	Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a model of supervision that examines and informs the understanding of professional development within a Professional Development School (PDS) context. It offers a theoretically-based model for supervision, drawing on three bodies of literature (supervision, teacher inquiry, and PDSs). The study constructed and explored a model for how supervisory practice might unfold over the course of a PDS year and how PDS supervision involves the interaction between multiple teacher educators. After describing the PDS at Pennsylvania State University and the State College Area School District, the paper describes the role of the Professional Development Associate (PDA), presents four phases of the PDS supervision model, and discusses the PDA's role in each phase. The phases include establishing readiness, traditional supervision, reflective supervision, and teacher inquiry driven supervision. The study found that interns progressed through the phases at different rates and that supervisors and mentors had to build a relationship of mutual trust and respect. The paper concludes with implications of the model for both supervisory practice and PDSs. (Contains 32 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 468 426

From Readiness To Inquiry:

The Unfolding of Supervision in the Professional Development School

Nancy Dana and Diane Yendol Silva

AERA, 2000

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nancy Dana

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP041028

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a model of supervision that examines and informs our understanding of professional development within a PDS context. Although PDSs are spreading quickly across the nation, reconceptualizing the role of supervision within a PDS has received little attention in the literature. This paper offers a practical and theoretically based model for supervision drawing on three bodies of literature: supervision, teacher inquiry, and professional development schools. By allowing supervision to unfold within a PDS context, the possibilities for prospective and practicing teachers to develop an inquiry stance to professional practice are enhanced and the conditions for reform-minded teaching created.

In an effort to build a new culture of professional learning within schools that will better meet the unique needs of today's students, many educators have advocated the creation of Professional Development Schools (Darling-Hammond, 1994, Levine, 1997). In fact, almost every commission and report on teacher education (Goodlad, 1990; Holmes, 1986, Holmes, 1990, Levine, 1992) advocates the Professional Development School as a strong vehicle for educational change. Darling-Hammond (1994) characterizes PDSs as "a special case of school restructuring: as they simultaneously restructure schools and teacher education programs, they redefine teaching and learning for all members of the profession and the school community" (p. 1).

As Professional Development Schools have rapidly sprung up across the nation the roles of one critical member and the meaning of one crucial concept of teacher education within the PDS has been neglected – the university supervisor and supervision. To date, the supervisor's role in the PDS has received minimal attention in the literature. In fact, in an extensive literature review on PDSs, Silva (1999) names only one mention of the role of supervisors in the PDS. Hoffman, Rosenbluth and McCrory's (1997) work suggests that PDS supervisors are spending more time in the schools, providing more continuity in feedback, and setting higher expectations for student teachers. However, they did not explicitly discuss the way the roles of supervisors are changing in a Professional Development School, nor how supervisors work with prospective and practicing teachers. The purpose of this paper is to explore the possibilities for prospective and practicing teacher supervision as it unfolds in the professional development school.

Background

Discussions advocating the key role of schools and cooperating teachers in the supervision of prospective teachers are not new. In fact, transforming the roles of supervisors and supervision in partnership with schools received attention decades ago. The following quotation from the 43rd Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching published in 1964 argued that:

> The schools are ready to assume a more active and responsible role in the supervision of student teaching. The colleges, in response, must seek new and effective ways to define partnership with the schools in this vital and necessarily cooperative task of teacher education (p. 145).

Likewise, while the Professional Development School movement has gained momentum in the last decade, the notions behind Professional Development Schools are not new. John Dewey (1896) was one of the first to suggest that schools and universities work together when he introduced the concept of the laboratory school. Although popular through the 1940's, the laboratory school concept lost momentum due to the high cost of operating these facilities. As a result, existing laboratory schools began to close across the county with few remaining today.

Today's Professional Development Schools embrace Dewey's notions, somewhat reviving the laboratory school notion, but in significantly different ways:

(1) Lab schools served selected students, mainly upper middle class in private institutions; PDSs serve all students in public school settings (MacNaughton & Johns, 1993).

(2) Lab schools were created as places where theoretical constructs could be empirically researched, emphasizing putting theory into practice; PDSs seek to

create new theories from an inquiry-based action research framework, thereby putting theory into practice, *and* practice into theory.

(3) University professors mainly governed lab schools; members from the school and university jointly govern PDSs.

Simultaneously, the field of supervision has evolved greatly since Dewey's laboratory schools. Those dissatisfied with the traditional model of supervision suggested a need for new approaches to supervision that enhance professional growth. For example, twenty-five years ago Goldhammer (1969) emphasized the need for supervision to become an opportunity to help teachers understand what they are doing, and why, by changing schools from places where teachers just act out "age-old rituals" to places where teachers participate fully in the process of supervision and their own professional development. Nolan and Huber (1989) described teacher reflection as the "driving force" behind teacher professional development and successful supervision programs. Unlike the "demoralizing" result of traditional supervision, Nolan and Huber describe successful supervision programs as "making a difference in the lives and instruction of teachers who participate in them, as well as the lives of the students they teach" (p.143).

More recently, Zeichner (1999) discusses the challenges that teacher educators often face as they create prospective teacher field experiences that are inclusive of reform-minded teaching practices. In many cases, prospective and practicing teachers continue to believe that the practically oriented field experiences are the most valuable component of their education (Lortie, 1975; Nemser, 1983). Since historically teacher preparation programs have unsuccessfully influenced teachers in schools, a

reconceptualized role of supervision in a PDS might offer a vehicle for creating reform-minded teacher education.

Although the undergirding framework of lab schools and supervision have an historical presence in the educational literature, today structures like the PDS and increased commitment to supervision by colleges of education allows the type of supervision advocated by Goldhammer (1969), Goldsberry (1986), and Nolan and Huber (1989) to unfold. Today new structures are being explored as school university partnerships and supervisory practices unfold in these extended field experiences advocated by almost every report on teacher education (Goodlad, 1990; Holmes, 1986; Holmes, 1990; Levine, 1992). Linking these two fields and bodies of literature yields an emerging conception of the supervisor's role in the Professional Development School.

The definition of the PDS in conjunction with the literature on powerful supervisory practices necessitates a closer look at the emerging roles of PDS supervisors and the work of supervision in a PDS. Approaching our work as two university teacher educators engaged in PDS supervision, we wondered: How can supervision in a PDS embrace clinical supervision? How can supervisors encourage reform-oriented teacher education? How can supervisors support the professional growth of both prospective and practicing teachers? What types of supervision best supports these overlapping goals?

We begin to address these questions by constructing and exploring a model for how supervisory practice might unfold over the course of a PDS year and how PDS supervision involves the interaction between multiple teacher educators. In presenting this model, we draw on both the Professional Development School literature and supervision literature, as well as our experiences as supervisors in a Professional

Development School. We begin our paper with a brief description of our Professional Development School program. This description provides the context for our discussion of the role of the supervisor within the PDS, as well as the presentation of a PDS supervision model that includes four phases: establishing readiness, traditional supervision, reflective supervision, and teacher inquiry driven supervision. We conclude with a discussion of the model presented and the implications this model has for both supervisory practice and Professional Development Schools.

Description of the PDS

The State College Area School District-Pennsylvania State University Professional Development Schools become the "living classrooms" for prospective teachers to learn the art and science of teaching. Their teaching develops through the completion of a full-year internship where learning to teach is accomplished through teaming with a mentor teacher for an entire school year.

Penn State students are selected to participate in the yearlong internship program through an extensive application and interview process. These interns abandon the Penn State calendar and adopt the State College Area School District calendar for the entire school year. They begin this field experience during the second week in August with an intensive two-week campus based preparation experience. Next interns join with their mentor for orientation, help prepare the classroom and attend professional district or school meetings. Once the year begins, the interns plan, teach, and inquire about teaching alongside their mentor on a daily basis.

Through seminars, coursework conducted on-site, and teaching alongside a mentor each day of the school year, interns earn 30 credits. These credits include: three

credits of math methods, science methods, social studies methods, classroom management, clinical field seminars and student teaching. Mentor teachers partner with Penn State teacher educators to develop and implement a structure for the coursework that ensures that the objectives of each of these courses are met within the school-based context. Mentors and Penn State teacher educators rely on The Penn State Elementary and Kindergarten Conceptual Framework for organizing and structuring the internship experience.

The Penn State Elementary and Kindergarten Education Conceptual Framework undergirds all of the work required and completed by undergraduate education majors at Penn State. By the end of the internship, the intern must be able to demonstrate competency in each area of the outcomes framework: 1) Planning and Preparation for Learning with Understanding, 2) The Act of Teaching, 3) Facilitating Learning with Understanding, 4) Reflection of Teaching for Understanding, and 5) Maintaining Professional Responsibilities. Interns utilize the conceptual framework throughout the internship as they document their growth in their portfolio and set goals for their learning. The conceptual framework also provides foci for journaling and acts as a guide for the collaborative creation of an I.I.P. (Intern's Individualized Plan) by the mentor teacher, the Penn State teacher educator, and the intern. Interns follow their own unique I.I.P. to ensure their growth and development in all areas of the conceptual framework.

Additionally, a unique feature of the internship is an explicit focus on teacher inquiry. Throughout the internship, mentor teachers and teacher educators from Penn State join with prospective teachers to inquire about teaching and learning at the PDS site. Mentor teachers inquire together with interns in one of three ways: (1) Shared

Inquiry - mentor and intern define and conduct a single teacher inquiry project together; (2) Parallel Inquiry - mentor and intern support each other in their individual endeavors as they simultaneously conduct individual teacher research projects, and (3) Inquiry Support - intern takes full ownership of inquiry project and mentor helps intern formulate "wonderings," design project, collect data, and analyze data.

The inquiry projects focus on some type of pedagogy, a particular child/children in the classroom, one's own teaching beliefs, or the State College Area School District curriculum. The projects are presented at an annual Professional Development School Teacher Inquiry Conference. The conference is attended by teachers and administrators from across the district, Penn State faculty and administrators, and the interns that were selected to begin their internship during the next school year. The conference serves as a forum for all members of the Professional Development School community to learn from the accomplishments and wonderings of each other.

In summary, our PDS program departs from our traditional program in three important ways: (1) mentor and intern *teaming* to teach children throughout an *entire* school year, (2) mentors working closely with Penn State teacher educators to plan the intern teacher education curriculum on an individual basis, and (3) mentor and intern engaging in teacher inquiry. Due to these shifts in foci, we recognized the need to redefine the role of the traditional supervisor.

From Supervisor to PDA

Consistent with our goal of creating a reform minded teacher education program, the role of the supervisor in this PDS expands to include not only facilitating the

prospective teacher's professional growth, but also supporting the professional growth of practicing teachers. By working an entire school year with the same intern and mentor, the supervisor becomes intimately involved in the classroom, getting to know, and sometimes even teaching the children in the Professional Development School. We struggled to find a name that would describe this expanded supervision role, just as Morris Cogan and his contemporaries "groped for terms" to describe the cycle of supervision thirty years ago (Garman, 1982, p. 38). Our struggle for a new term to describe our work was focused on the recommendations for a new term made by Nolan (1989):

> What should be the nature of the new term? It must imply a relationship of equality, of mutual vulnerability, of mutual leadership. It must describe a relationship marked by unconditional professional regard, the professional competence of both partners accepted as a given; a relationship marked by skilled service, ethical conduct, curiosity, a willingness to suspend disbelief, and a genuine desire to achieve a greater understanding of the teaching-learning process on both parts (p. 40)

All names seemed to be inadequate to capture what we envisioned to be the nature of a supervisor's work in the PDS so eloquently stated by Nolan. The name finally chosen was Professional Development Associate (PDA) and the following "job description" was created:

> The role of the Professional Development Associate is to support the professional development of the interns and the mentor teachers during the school year. PDAs visit their school sites weekly, conducting

> observations of interns, spending time with mentors, interns, and public school children, and serving as a resource for all members of the Professional Development School community (Dana, Silva, and Colangelo, 1998, Pg. 4).

The general responsibilities of the PDA include: helping interns actualize the objectives of the Elementary and Kindergarten Teacher Education Outcomes Framework, dialoguing in an intern triad journal, conducting intern observations, sharing professional development opportunities with intern and mentor, meeting regularly with mentor and intern to review progress toward outcomes framework, facilitating and supporting intern and mentor inquiry work, and planning and conducting relevant seminars for prospective and practicing teachers targeted at connecting theory and practice. In addition, PDAs may demonstrate for or co-teach lessons with mentors and/or interns, or teach a lesson simply to provide release time for a mentor and intern to engage in teacher inquiry or other forms of professional development.

We believed that the term "Professional Development Associate" captured the roles and responsibilities of the university-based teacher educator in a much more holistic fashion than "university supervisor." The name change also helped to symbolize the movement from the university partner being viewed primarily as an evaluator of prospective teachers to that of facilitator of professional development for both intern and mentor teacher. Nolan (1989) states:

> For most classroom teachers, the term supervision connotes a relationship in which a superior pops unannounced into the teacher's room with a "hit me with your best shot" attitude, then retreats to the office to compose a

> somewhat stardardized set of strengths and suggestions for improvement. Most teachers suffer this yearly ritual as simply part of the job; few teachers who are accustomed to hearing glowing praise for their performance even welcome the ritual. Such ancient, well internalized scripts are difficult to erase. Replacing the term supervision with a more appropriate term would be an important step toward helping teachers to expect something different, toward changing those unproductive scripts.

Our hope was that the name change from supervisor to PDA would help us to create a new script for our work in the PDS.

Phases of PDS Supervision

So what does the work of a PDA look like in practice? As one goal of Professional Development Schools is the simultaneously renewal of teacher education and public school education, it is important that the work of a PDA in practice helps to facilitate reform minded teaching. We define "reform-minded teaching" as a professional stance towards teaching that problematizes teaching practice and related issues of education and schooling. We accomplish this by moving through a series of four phases of supervision over the school year – readiness, traditional supervision, reflective supervision, and supervision within inquiry. The ultimate goal of progressing through the phases is to open the doors for teacher inquiry, a teacher-driven form of professional growth, to unfold in each PDS classroom. We believe that teacher research is one critical vehicle for reform minded teaching to occur, as Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1993) suggest that in every classroom where teaching is viewed as research, "there is a radical but quiet kind of school reform in process" (p. 101).

The following sections outline a description of each phase of the supervision cycle, and the ways each phase may unfold during the PDS school year. For the purposes of this paper, we limit our discussion to the PDA's role (For further discussion of the mentor's role in PDS supervision, please see Silva, 1999).

Phase One: Establishing Readiness

During this stage of supervision, Establishing Readiness, three different roles emerge for the Professional Development Associate. These roles include cultivating relationships, coaching, and inquiry. Consistent with the reflective supervision literature (Garman, 1982), as the PDA enters the PDS sites she must focus on cultivating professional relationships with mentors, interns, and school support staff. This phase typically lasts about two months and is necessary for building trust as well as an understanding of the supervision context. The following excerpt from a PDA journal suggests the importance of establishing relationships with those in the schools:

> Today I really felt like we took a major step. I spent all day in the school without a traditional trip sheet and pen in hand. Instead, I just moved from classroom to classroom and watched, helped, talked with teachers, interns, and children. In one classroom, I spent time working with Dave, a child who was struggling to write his name and color his portrait. In another class I met Pam who is a little girl with multiple handicaps who is a fully included child. In the kindergarten class, two children curled up on my lap and read a book. In the second grade class, I helped a small group of children with problem solving. The day reminded me of the incredible challenges that teachers face each and every day. I continue to be in awe

> of the work that they can accomplish. Later, I spent time in the office talking with the secretary. We talked about the PDA using the staff sign-in sheet so that she would know where I was during the day… I feel like I am finally forming the kind of relationships with the people in the schools that authenticate this PDS work. (Journal, September 1998)

Although the PDA needs to build professional relationships between the PDS members and herself, the PDA also needs to strengthen relationship between the interns and other instructional and non-instructional school personnel. Relationship building between all professionals in the Professional Development School is important as Darling-Hammond (1994) states:

> Because (PDSs) are schoolwide innovations, they go beyond the particularistic relationship a student teacher may have with a cooperating teacher by creating an overall environment for professional practice, professional collegueship, and for ongoing collective work and inquiry (p.8).

At this school, the PDA worked to build relationships between interns and the instructional support teacher, media specialist, school psychologist, math specialist, and reading specialist by identifying opportunities to collaborate on behalf of children. Additionally, the PDA began to plant the seeds for inquiry as she met with these support personnel by describing the inquiry work that would be forthcoming and identifying how they could become involved in inquiry.

The emphasis on building relationships is time-consuming and requires the university and PDA to make a commitment to a physical presence at the site for extended periods of time. Additionally, the role of relationship building extends to the classroom

children as well, requiring the PDA to be a willing and active instructional participant in the classroom.

Also of importance is the PDA's role as a facilitator of communication between the university and the schools. The PDA must be sure to use the understandings gained from these newly formed relationships to help facilitate the goals of the PDS. Drawn from the PDA's journal is the following excerpt:

> The teachers clearly are interested in the thinking and the perspectives of the university faculty that will be involved. They ask me how and when the university faculty teaching the methods courses will be involved. Could these people come to their classrooms and work with kids? Could they share their thinking behind the syllabi and assignments so that the mentors would be able to help the interns bridge the gap between theory and practice? What I wonder is what I can do about this. I know I need to make these expectations explicit to those at the university. It seems like the teachers are reaching out towards developing a partnership. (Journal, October, 1998)

Clearly, the relationship formed between the PDA and the teachers within the PDS is a line of communication different from that found in a traditional supervision model. The conversations are extending beyond the supervision of the intern to larger issues impacting the development of the PDS. As a result of this type of communication, our methods instructors began co-planning the coursework with a team of mentors and co-teaching methods courses with teachers.

The second role emphasizes the PDA as a *coach* for both the intern and the mentor. The supervisor as a coach is a key feature in the supervision literature (Costa & Garmston, 1994). In the PDS, the PDA assumes a "coach like" role for interns by documenting the intern's teaching and providing informal feedback, dialoguing with interns in reflective journals, working with teachers to identify strengths and weaknesses of the interns, and facilitating the mentor/intern relationship. In addition to serving as a coach for the intern, the PDA coaches mentors in their journey to become teacher educators. Based on our PDS work, the greatest challenge of this phase is helping the mentor feel comfortable in her role as teacher educator. This challenge is illustrated in the following excerpt:

> I left the meeting realizing that many of these teachers were stressed about not knowing exactly what to expect of the full year interns. They didn't seem comfortable structuring the field experience based on the intern. They were used to structuring the intern's experience around the university's curriculum- the former student teaching handbook. At the beginning of the year, we had given them the Outcomes Framework and suggested phases of participation the interns would proceed through but that wasn't specific enough for them. The teachers were asking for more structure. We need to know which lesson plan format and how many lessons to require. We need to know what other people are doing. (Journal, November)

Clearly, these teachers were either not ready or did not feel the freedom to develop a teaching plan that would accommodate the unique needs and abilities of their individual

intern. The response to these teachers' voiced concerns was the collaborative development of a resource guide that would help the mentors begin their journey to become teacher educators. The framework for this guide was developed by the teachers and the guide was written as a resource not a manual (Dana, Silva, and Colangelo, 1999). During this phase, coaching to support the mentor teacher's development as a teacher educator becomes as important as the ways coaching is traditionally conceptualized in the preservice teacher supervision literature.

The third role of the PDA during this phase is *supervisor as inquirer* into the intern's classroom and ways to help the interns link theory and practice at the early stages of their development. This role recognizes the importance of the PDA as a learner or inquirer into the classroom context. During this phase, the PDA takes time to model inquiry as a tool for knowing the classrooms. This includes spending time with the children, learning the daily schedules, and understanding the espoused and lived platforms of the mentors and interns with whom she is working.

Understanding the espoused and lived platforms of mentors and interns is a key element of the supervision process (Goldsberry & Nolan 1983). Understanding is a prerequisite to both intern and mentor professional development as evidenced in the following excerpt from a PDA's journal:

> I am concerned about the lack of space for Rachel to learn in this room. This is becoming particularly evident when I observe her lessons. Rachel's mentor gives her very structured opportunities to teach. She tells Rachel how to do everything. Each step is described down to the color of the marker that she should use to create visuals. Most of the teaching

> occurs in whole groups with the children sitting at the carpet listening to the teacher. This will be a problem because I fear that I will not be able to see Rachel participate in "thoughtful risk-taking." I know I need to help Rachel find space to practice her teaching. I need to figure out a way for her mentor to let her experiment. (Journal, January)

Understanding the characteristics of the context, the mentor teacher's espoused platform and the intern's espoused platform helps the PDA facilitate intern and mentor growth as well as heighten the PDA's awareness of potential obstacles to growth.

With insights into the espoused platform and context, a PDA is also able to identify ways to help the interns connect theory and practice. According to Darling-Hammond's definition of Professional Development Schools, the connection of theory and practice is the raison d'etre for the existence of Professional Development Schools. Yet, particularly at the beginning of an intern's development as a teacher, it is most challenging. The following excerpt from a PDA journal illustrates this challenge:

> As I sat in Marge's math group watching her work with her first grade students with the unifix cubes, I thought about the math methods instructor's focus on conceptual understanding in class. I wondered if Marge was truly interested in the children's conceptual understanding. Clearly, her questions as well as her directions indicated she was interested in process. After the lesson, we spent time discussing whether she was focusing on procedural or conceptual knowledge. We talked about the questions she asked the children. We talked about how she was informally assessing the students. I think by the end of our discussion she

> realized that what she had spent so much talking about in her math ed class she was not doing in her teaching. I wonder what will happen tomorrow in Marge's class when I am not there watching. (Journal, October)

By understanding both the school and university context, the PDA can help connect theory and practice enabling the PDA to link coursework and supervision. In sum, establishing readiness requires the PDA to build relationships between PDS participants, help teachers assume the role of teacher educator, understand the participants' espoused platforms, and through inquiry learn about the intern's "living classroom."

Phase Two: Traditional Supervision

During this second phase, the PDA continues cultivating relationships and inquiring into the context and players of the triad as discussed in Phase One. However, during this phase that usually occurs during the third or fourth month of the internship, the supervision assumes a more traditional or directed flavor and generally focuses more on the intern's growth. At this point in the year, the interns begin to experiment in planning and implementing their own lessons and during these teaching moments the PDA observes and provides feedback relating to the elements of a lesson. In most cases, the feedback during this phase focuses on classroom management, pacing, and the inclusion of elements of a good lesson. The PDA typically provides the lens, the focus of the observation, and the direction of the post conference. The routine follows the cycle of supervison. However, the cycle is much more PDA directed than the teacher-owned

process advocated in the clinical supervision literature. The following excerpt presents a post observation conference led by a PDA during Phase Two:

> I met with Sarah today after observing her read aloud. Her mentor had mentioned some areas to me that she felt Sarah needed to work on and I could see clearly by the end of my observation she was right. Sarah had wonderful materials and had selected a lovely book. However, she did not understand how to make the book come alive. She hurried through the reading and rarely asked the children questions. She seemed to be in her own world and really didn't include the elements of a good read aloud. After she finished the read aloud we met for our conference. I began by asking Sarah what she felt went well and she quickly responded that she didn't quite know what went well. She was really nervous. At that point, I pointed out that she had done a great job selecting a book and gathering motivating materials. Then, I talked her through some of the areas that seemed more problematic. By the end of the meeting, I asked Sarah to observe with me her mentor doing a read aloud. Together, we would then create a rubric that might help her assess her own read alouds. I also suggested a number of techniques that I use that she might incorporate into her read aloud to make it more effective. (Journal, December)

This excerpt indicates a supervision method driven by the PDA not the intern. An important aspect of this phase of supervision is the inclusion of the mentor. Throughout this phase, the PDA incorporates the mentor and the mentor's understandings into the supervision process. In this case, the mentor, intern, and PDA collaboratively discussed

the "makings" of a good read aloud and the mentor modeled the teaching as the PDA and intern both observed. This approach capitalizes on the strengths each player brings to the supervision process and includes the mentor in the business of teacher education. Consistent with the literature on prospective teacher development (Fuller & Brown, 1975; Kagan, 1992), at this point in the intern's experience, the intern is typically still working on the basic elements of a good lesson and is just beginning to raise broader questions about his/her own practice.

Phase Three: Reflective Supervision

As interns begin to feel more comfortable implementing the basic elements of a lesson and develop confidence in their classroom management, they become more cognizant of questions that they can ask about their practice. At this point, usually during the fifth and sixth months, the interns, mentors, and PDAs begin to engage in the process of reflective supervision. Similar to the type of supervision described by Glickman (1990) as non-directive, we adopt a form of reflective supervision based on the work of Goldsberry and Nolan (1983). They describe the reflective cycle as a time when the supervisor assumes control of the process rather than the product of reflection by acting as a guide rather than a "prescriber." During this third phase, the supervisor guides the teacher through a process of analyzing teaching behaviors and their impact on the learner.

Reflective supervision provides a vehicle for both the practicing teacher and the intern to utilize the inquiry cycle (Silva, 1999a) as well as the PDA and intern. According to Nolan and Huber, reflective supervision begins with a meeting between the supervisor and teacher in which the supervisor guides the teacher through a process of

analyzing her own teaching behaviors and the impact of these behaviors on the learner. Goldsberry and Nolan (1983) describe five characteristics of reflective supervisory practice including supervision: 1) based on a platform of aims, 2) focused on learner outcomes, 3) based on shared control of conferences, 4) where decisions are preceded by guided reflection, and 5) where a spirit of experimentation is apparent. The goal of this collaborative supervision is to help prospective teachers become more reflective, analytical, self-directed, and adept at identifying and implementing improvements in their teaching (Nolan & Hillkirk, 1991). In the PDS, both the mentor and PDA use the following elements of the reflective supervision as they work with interns:

- Cycles of pre-conferencing, observation, and post-conferencing for examining how classroom events affect students and what relationship the events have to the teacher's espoused beliefs about teaching
- Shared control over the process because both mentor and/or PDA and intern contribute their insights and understandings
- Norms of inquiry and experimentation that focus on testing hypotheses through data collected during observations
- Continuity in the coaching process over time

The following excerpt acknowledges the intern's role in focusing the observation and drawing conclusions about her own teaching:

> Today Jan was particularly interested in whether she was balancing her emphasis on content of the morning letter with her focus on building reading skills. She asked me to collect data that might help her answer that question. She also indicated that the balance was critical because of

> time restrictions. We decided to script each of the questions she asked the children and we would then categorize them. She also asked me to note the time of the various components to the morning letter. After our conference, it was clear to me that Jan was asking herself questions important to her own teaching and that her reflections on the data would make a difference.

During this phase of supervision in the Professional Development School, the PDA clearly engages in more listening, reflecting, and clarifying behaviors while the intern does the majority of the data analysis, problem solving, and decision making. However, as described by Goldsberry and Nolan (1983), the still takes primary responsibility for guiding the process of reflection. We believe that the goals and process of reflective supervision are able to be actualized in the yearlong internship since the time and resources are present to support the inquiry cycle. In an inquiry oriented Professional Development School, reflective supervision provides the foundation and naturally sets the stage for a more independent form of professional development, teacher inquiry.

Phase Four: Supervision Within Teacher Inquiry

The fourth phase of supervision within the PDS occurs as mentors and interns engage in collaborative action research during the final months of the Professional Development School year. At this time, supervision becomes located within the mentor and intern's teacher inquiry project and the interns, teachers, and PDAs collaboratively focus their attention on a question of interest to the intern and classroom teacher. The

supervisor no longer assumes primary responsibility for the process of reflection but rather the work of teacher inquiry is driven by the practicing and prospective teacher.

Inquiry-focused supervision includes Glickman's (1990) notion of collaborative supervision and we actualize this by the participants supporting each other as they investigate a research question. Collaboratively, the mentor, intern, and PDA collect data, conduct data analysis, problem solve, and make decisions. However, a subtle shift takes place as the participants move from reflective supervision to teacher inquiry. At this point, the mentor and intern are familiar with the inquiry process and begin driving the teacher research cycle. The PDA provides support for the process rather than the momentum behind the process. Through the reflective supervision process modeled in phase three and the more independent professional development associated with teacher inquiry, we cultivate a stance to professional development that goes beyond the completion of a project. Kettering describes this inquiry stance toward professional practice:

> Essentially research is nothing but a state of mind . . . a friendly, welcoming attitude toward change . . . going out to look for change instead of waiting for it to come (in Boyd, 1961)

The previous phases in the PDS supervision process help to cultivate this welcoming attitude and active seeking of change.

This attitude lays the foundation for an intern's first teacher inquiry and the many inquiries that will follow once a teacher assumes this stance toward her practice. Many teacher educators have advocated the introduction of research into prospective teacher education curriculum as a vehicle for creating habits of "self-monitoring" during

prospective teacher preparation (Biott, 1983; Rudduck, 1985). By building these skills and an inquiry stance toward teaching, both prospective and practicing teachers become teachers as life-long learners offering opportunities for reform minded teaching to thrive.

So what does this process of teacher inquiry look like in the PDS? In many ways, the teacher inquiry process mirrors the process of reflective supervision. The first steps of a teacher inquiry begins with brainstorming questions or wonderings. An intern's questions emerge from their "real world observations and dilemmas" (Hubbard and Powers, 1993, p. 2). Some examples of wonderings that interns might pursue in their classrooms include:

- How can I encourage more girls to participate more fully and take thoughtful risks in high school mathematics?
- How can I help my third grade students grow as writers in my classroom?
- How does this new spelling program contribute to 4th graders spelling progress in my classroom?
- How does a cooperative learning environment influence an apraxic/gifted child?
- In what ways do my classroom management and practices deter from my philosophy of teaching and my beliefs about how children learn?
- In what ways can puppets be utilized to enter the world of first graders and enhance classroom instruction?

While the subject of teachers' inquiries are diverse, four general categories for their work have emerged and include: (1) focus on some aspect of pedagogy, (2) focus on a

particular child/children in the classroom, (3) focus on one's own teaching beliefs, and (4) focus on the curriculum.

Once teacher inquirers have defined a focus for their work and a wondering to pursue, the next step is developing a plan for data collection. Meaningful teacher inquiry should not depart from the daily work of teachers, but become a part of their everyday classroom activities. Hence, developing a plan for data collection means thinking about life in the classroom/school and the ways life in the classroom/school can be "captured" as data.

To capture "action" in the classroom, many teacher inquirers observe and take fieldnotes, tape record or video tape and transcribe, diagram the classroom, or have others such as an administrator, co-teacher inquirer, paraprofessional, mentor or intern, instructional support teacher, or university researcher notetake for them. To capture student productivity in the classroom, many teachers save student work, stamping dates on work to know when it was produced. Additionally, teacher inquirers may collect classroom, school, and district artifacts. These include all documents produced in the classroom or school that may be related to the wondering such as curriculum guides, parent newsletters, and correspondence to and from parents, principal, and specialists.

To capture the talk that occurs in the school and in the classroom, teacher inquirers may employ interviewing. Interviews can be informal or spontaneous or more thoughtfully planned. Depending on the teacher inquirer's wondering, interviewing children in the classroom as well as adults such as parents, administrators, other classroom teachers, and instructional support teachers can be a rich source of data.

To capture thinking that occurs in the school and classroom, teacher inquirers often keep their own journals reflecting on their own thought processes as well as ask students "to journal" about their thinking related to the project at hand. Additionally, more formal mechanisms can be employed (such as surveys and sociograms) to capture the action, talk, thinking and productivity that are a part of each and every school day. Data collection is not separate from teaching, but part of what the teacher does each day in the classroom.

As teacher inquirers collect data, they simultaneously engage in data analysis. Hubbard and Power (1993) describe data analysis as "the process of bringing order, structure, and meaning to the data, to discover what is underneath the surface of the classroom" (p. 65). Analysis involves reading and rereading collected data looking for categories or patterns to appear.

Throughout the teacher inquiry process, teacher inquirers also search for and read relevant literature related to their work. In essence, the literature serves as another source of data, another way to systematically gain insights into the question or wondering the teacher inquirer pursues. By utilizing the literature as a data source, a teacher inquirer's work is located within and connected to the thinking of others in the field of education.

The final process of a focused teacher inquiry is writing up the results of a particular inquiry and sharing the findings with others. Whatever the subject of a teacher's inquiry, the process of teacher inquiry is exhilarating, renewing, and rewarding for teachers. Dana, Gimbert, and Silva (1999) provide a complete description of the inquiry process and discuss the role inquiry plays in on-going professional development.

As indicated, the PDA's role during the teacher inquiry process both expands and shifts slightly from the role the PDA plays in reflective supervision. First, the PDA helps mentors and interns learn about the process of teacher inquiry and the ways in which teacher inquiry can be a powerful tool for reform minded teaching. In our case, this occurred through seminars where we read about teacher inquiry, read examples of teacher inquiries, and listened to teacher researchers present their work. Next, similar to the supervisor's role in reflective supervision, the PDA conferences with mentors and interns and helps mentor and intern define questions, ways to collect data to answer their questions, and ways to articulate the learning that has occurred through the systematic study of a classroom question. The PDA may also gather literature to support the teachers' research, take directions from the mentor- intern teacher research team to help in data collection, and/or teach as a substitute in the PDS classroom so mentor and intern can be freed up to collect or analyze data to inform their inquiry. The PDA role shifts slightly from being the coach providing the momentum in the reflective supervision process to becoming a support person for the teacher's completion of the inquiry project and the development of an inquiry stance towards teaching.

Based on our PDS work, inquiry appears to be a meaningful supervision experience that provides both prospective and practicing teachers with a collaborative tool for more independent, career-long professional growth and development. In fact, our mentors and interns have described the power of inquiry in the following ways:

> By looking to the classroom for problems or things that puzzle you and then researching them, you can help your students by doing research… as

you learn more they can be helped by your new knowledge. (mentor teacher, March interview)

A lot of times professional development is done to you by an outside force and by an outside administrator. Inquiry is something that is very personal to you because it is something you are questioning about and that you are trying very hard to solve... a problem within your own classroom. (Mentor teacher, March interview)

We believe cultivating an inquiry stance is the ultimate goal of supervision in the PDS not the completion of a project. An inquiry stance enhances the education of public school children, improves teacher education, and leads to simultaneous renewal and co-reform. An inquiry stance sets the stage for both reform minded teaching and reform minded teacher education.

Conclusions

Based on our supervision work, supervisors within PDSs could be well served by adopting this eclectic approach to facilitating intern and mentor teacher professional development. By drawing on four different phases of supervision, we are able to 1) understand the context and build relationships, 2) help interns develop basic teaching skills using a directed form of supervision, 3) engage interns in reflective supervision, and 4) support interns/mentors in the more independent process of teacher inquiry.

In our work we have found that interns progress through these phases at different rates. PDAs need to be aware of these developmental differences and adjust the mode of supervision to the developmental readiness of the intern. For example, some interns are

ready to leave a directed form of supervision early in the internship year. Whereas other interns, typically those at risk, are often still engaged in directed forms of supervision much later in the year. Interestingly, the form of supervision engaged in at particular times of the year often indicate that an intern is either particular strong or weak.

Clearly, many challenges exist in adopting this type of supervision within the PDS. The work is time and relationship intensive. University-based teacher educators need to spend a significant amount of time establishing readiness in the classrooms by creating relationships with interns, teachers, children, and support staff. These relationships are difficult to nurture due to tensions of hostility and skepticism, and lack of trust (Trubowitz, 1986). The changing nature of supervision within the PDS requires a substantive commitment from colleges in the business of educating teachers.

In addition to time, the supervisor and mentor must build a relationship of mutual trust and respect. The collaborative relationship must become strong enough to support the introduction of inquiry into the PDS setting. Inquiry can feel threatening to the teacher since inquiry implies critical thinking and continual questioning of one's practice. Hence, trust between PDAs and teachers and the teachers' self-confidence must be built. Once this type of inquiry oriented culture is established, all participants can begin raising the questions of what makes a reform minded teacher and what makes reform minded teacher education. All participants need to be comfortable with raising questions about their practices within the PDS community.

This paper outlines how supervision evolves over the course of a yearlong undergraduate internship in a Professional Development School. However, we have not addressed the importance if what Sparks-Langer and Colton (1991) describe as the

critical element of reflection as we engage in this supervisory work with interns and mentors. This critical element refers to the substance that drives the prospective teachers' thinking including their experiences, goals, values, and understandings of social implications. The supervision experience is only as strong as the critical elements upon which it rests. Thus, as we reconceptualize supervision for the PDS, serious attention should be given to developing these critical elements as a part of each and every phase of supervision. This is a challenge of our work. By raising questions that emphasize these "critical elements" during each of the four phases of supervision and taking this process seriously, we can address this concern as well as the following concern discussed by Gore and Zeichner (1991):

> We do not think that it makes much sense to promote or assess reflective practice in general without establishing clear priorities for the reflection that emerge out of a reasoned educational and social philosophy. We do not accept the implication that exists throughout much of the literature, that teachers' actions are necessarily better just because they are more deliberate and intentional. (p.120)

Engaging in conversations with interns and mentors about their reasoned educational and social philosophy continues to be a challenge of our work. However, we have developed a supervision process in which to embed this challenge and that remains to be the key focus of our supervision with in Professional Development School.

References

Biott, C. (1983). The Foundations of Classroom Action-Research in Initial Teacher Training. Journal of Education for Teaching. 9, (2), 152-60.

Cochran-Smith & Lytle (1993). Inside/Outside: Teacher research and knowledge. New York: Teachers College Press.

Costa, A.L., & Garmston, R.J. (1994). Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Dana, N. F., Colangelo, L., & Silva, D. (1998). The mentor teacher research guide. Program documentation submitted to State College Area School District - Penn State University College of Education Professional Development School.

Dana, N. F., Gimbert, B., & Silva, D. Y. (1999). Teacher inquiry: Staff development for the 21st Century. Pennsylvania Educational Leadership, 18(2), 6-12.

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.). (1994). Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dewey (1896). The university school. University Record, 5, 417-442.

Fuller, F.F., & Brown, O.H. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (ed.), Teacher Education (74th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Pt.II, pp. 25-52). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Garman, N. B. (1982). The clincial approach to supervision. In T.J. Sergiovanni (Ed.). Supervision of Teaching. Alexandria, VA: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 35-54.

Glickman, C.D. (1990). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Goldsberry, L. (1986). Is clinical supervision practical? In W.J. Smyth (Ed.) Learning about teaching through clinical supervision. London: Croom Helm Inc.

Goldsberry, L. & Nolan, J.F. (1983). Reflective supervision conference. (Unpublished manuscript), The Pennsylvania State University.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. I. (1994). Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gore, J.M. & Zeichner, K.M. (1991). Action research and reflective teaching in preservice teacher education: A case study from the United States. Teaching and Teacher Education, 7, 119-136.

Hoffman, N.E., Rosenblusth, G.S., & McCrory, K. (1997). The story of changing school-university relationships. In Hoffman, N.E., Reed, W.M., & Rosenbluth, G.S., eds., Lessons from restructuring experiences: Stories of change in professional development schools. State University of New York Press.

The Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author.

The Holmes Group (1990). Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Hubbard, R. S., & Power, B. M. (1993). The art of classroom inquiry: A handbook for teacher-researchers. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research. 62, 2, 129-169.

Levine, M. (1992). A conceptual framework for professional practice schools. In M. Levine (Ed.), Professional practice schools: Linking teacher education and school reform. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MacNaughton, R. and Johns, F. (1993). The professional development school: An emerging concept. Contemporary Education, 64(4), 215-218.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp.150-170). New York: Longman.

Nolan, J.F. (1989). Can Supervisory Practice Embrace Schon's View of Reflective Supervision? Journal of Curriculum and Supervision,. 5 (1), 35-40.

Nolan, J.F., & Hilkirk, K. (1991). The impact of skilled reflective supervision on veteran teachers. Paper presented at annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Nolan, J.F., & Huber, T. (1989). Nurturing the reflective practitioner through instructional supervision: A review of the literature. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 4 (2), 52-56.

Rudduck, J.(1985). Teacher Research and Research-Based Teacher Education. Journal of Education for Teaching. 11(3), 281-89.

Silva, D. Y. (1999). Telling their Stories: Mentor Teachers' Ways of Being and Knowing in a Professional Development School. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Trubowitz, S. (1986). Stages in the development of school-college collaboration. Educational Leadership, 43(5), 28-32.

Zeichner, K. (1999). The new scholarship in teacher education. Educational Researcher. 28 (9), 4-15.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: From Readiness To Inquiry: The Unfolding of Supervision in the Professional Development School

Author(s): Nancy Fichtman Dana

Corporate Source: Pennsylvania State University

Publication Date: April 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Nancy Dana	Printed Name/Position/Title: Associate Professor of Education
Organization/Address: 146 Chambers Bldg	Telephone: (814)865-2190 FAX:
	E-Mail Address: nfd1@psu.edu Date: 5/17/00

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20772
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)